

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

NOV 15 2005

## LAW OFFICES

**ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE**  
CHARTEREDMORTON J. ROSENBERG  
DAVID I. KLEIN  
JUN Y. LEE  
RAJIV S. SHAH \*PATENT AGENTS  
DAVID R. WOOD

3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE

ELLICOTT CITY, MARYLAND 21043

PHONE (410)-465-6678 OR (410)-465-MORT

TELEFAX (410)-461-3067

INTERNET: rkl@rklpatlaw.com

PATENT, TRADEMARK &amp; COPYRIGHT MATTERS

PATENT RESEARCH  
SPECIALISTSJOHN V. PRESTIA  
RAYMOND J. DUDEK  
EVA BURDMAN  
RUSSELL SCHUMANN  
KEVIN PHIPPS

\* PA and DC Bars

DATE: 15 November 2005 TIME SENT: A.M. (P.M.) 4:10

TOTAL PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET): 9 ( )

ATTENTION: Examiner B. P. Yenke Group Art Unit # 2675

TO: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

TO FAX NUMBER: 1-571-273-8300

TRANSMITTING FROM: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE  
Facsimile Number: 410-461-3067  
Telephone Number: 410-465-6678

OUR DOCKET NO: MR2919-16 APPLICATION SERIAL NO: 09/492,728

**PLEASE NOTIFY US AT ONCE IF NOT RECEIVED PROPERLY.**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

**FORMAL COMMUNICATION FOR ENTRY**Forwarded is a Remarks in Support of Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review  
responsive to Office Action dated \_\_\_\_\_  
for filing and processing.Morton J. Rosenberg  
Registration No. 26,049



MJR/tea

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional) MR2919-16	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by <del>first class mail</del> <del>United States Postal Service with sufficient postage and first class mail</del> <del>mark postage indicia and Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of</del> <del>Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</del> [37 CFR 1.8(a)] facsimile transmitted to the USPTO on <u>15 November 2005</u> Signature  Typed or printed name <u>Jun Y. Lee</u>		Application Number <u>09/492,728</u> Filed <u>27 January 2000</u> First Named Inventor <u>Rex A. Naden</u> Art Unit <u>2675</u> Examiner <u>B.P. Yenke</u>	
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.  This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.  The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the <input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/06) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>40,262</u> <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____		 Signature <u>Jun Y. Lee</u> Typed or printed name <u>(410) 465-6678</u> Telephone number <u>15 November 2005</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total of <u>2</u> forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

MR2919-16

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

NOV 15 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Rex A. Naden : Group Art Unit  
Serial No: 09/492,728 : 2675  
Filed: 27 January 2000 : Examiner:  
Title: HIGH-SPEED RF LINK FOR A : B.P. Yenke  
MULTI-USER MEETING

**REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF**  
**REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the RCE/Amendment filed by Applicant on 3 June 2005, the Examiner issued a further Office Action rejecting all pending Claims. While this Office Action was not made final, it is the latest of multiple actions rejecting the Claims in this case. The Examiner in this Office Action repeats the rejections of Claims set forth in the final Office Action of 3 March 2005 (responsive to which the Claims had been last amended).

At the 2 June 2005 Examiner's Interview which preceded the latest RCE and Amendment filing, the Examiner acknowledged subject to further search and consideration that the pending Claims, amended as then proposed, appeared allowable over the prior art of record, including the May et al. reference (See Interview Summary Record dated 2 June 2005). The Amendment filed with the RCE did in fact amend the Claims precisely as proposed, yet the Examiner again asserts the earlier rejections,<sup>1</sup> doing so without relying on any different or additional prior art. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner reasserts the same rejections of Claims made in the earlier final Office Action – namely, the rejection of Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flohr in view of Narayanaswami and May, et al., and Claims 30-32 under the same statutory section as being unpatentable over Flohr in view of

MR2919-16  
Serial Number: 09/492,728

Examiner relies instead on a re-reading of certain peripheral language in Applicant's disclosure to justify the further rejection of Claims.

The Examiner's basis for reasserting the earlier rejections is unfounded for at least the following reasons:

1. The Examiner cites against the Claims prior art disclosure of a feature which the independent Claims currently pending do not even affirmatively recite; and,
2. There is no reasonable basis for correlating the concept of data compression to any limitation affirmatively recited in the pending independent Claims.

**1. Data Compression Feature Cited by Examiner Not Affirmatively Recited in Pending Base Claims**

In the present Office Action, the Examiner refers to the Background section of Applicant's disclosure (page 1, paragraph 2) for its passing mention of data transport in uncompressed/compressed forms, and derives from this apparent basis for taking the cited prior art to now read on the Claims as amended.<sup>2</sup> The Examiner observes first that transmission of data in compressed format is known, pointing to the Flohr reference for disclosing as much. Then, fully acknowledging that May et al. discloses only the transmission of changes to a file between user stations (rather than the graphical image data actually constituting the changed file), the Examiner cites the reference as nonetheless disclosing the very limitations in the Claims which pertain to transmission of such graphical image data of a modified image. The Examiner

---

Narayanaswami and May, et al., further in view of the FCC 96-193 Publication. The Examiner relies on no other additional references, and adds no other bases for rejection.

<sup>2</sup> To the extent that the Examiner seemingly reduces Applicant's asserted invention to a generalized unclaimed concept, or to a certain isolated limitation of the Claims, Applicant unequivocally rejects the very notion. It is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention is defined by no less than the unique combination of limitations recited by each pending Claim, and not by any generalized concept, or any by particular limitation in and of itself.

MR2919-16

Serial Number: 09/492,728

simply offers as supporting rationale that the “transmitting of changes” disclosed by May et al. represent “the very definition/scheme behind compression,” (Office Action, page 3, line 2).

If data compression were the claimed limitation in question, the Examiner’s reasoning would be easier to follow. But, it is not. While recited in certain of the dependent Claims, data compression quite plainly is not recited in any of the pending independent Claims 1, 10, and 14. The Examiner’s reliance on that feature to maintain rejection of all Claims is, therefore, misplaced.

The Examiner offers no logical connection, conceptual or otherwise, between the use of the compression format for data transport and any limitation actually recited in one or more of the pending independent Claims. Consequently, the Examiner’s justification for reasserting the Claims rejections leaves an inexplicable gap in logic.

**2. No Reasonable Correlation Between Data Compression and Any Affirmative Limitation of Pending Base Claims**

The Examiner’s apparent rationale for attributing the concept of data compression to a necessary limitation of the pending base Claims is far from clear. Presumably, the Examiner is somehow correlating the concept of data compression with that of independently operable transceivers operating “to transfer and receive graphical image data of the shared image to and from the projector wireless transceiver,” as independent Claim 1 recites, for instance. Perhaps the Examiner is correlating the concept of data compression with the “capability to simultaneously modify the same shared image and transfer the modified image,” as the Claim also recites. The would-be correlation abruptly fails in either event.

MR2919-16

Serial Number: 09/492,728

As one skilled in the art would readily recognize, data compression is a bandwidth optimizing technique which boosts the efficiency of information transmission between sender and recipient. The technique reduces the transmitted size of a communication, while permitting lossless re-creation of the transmitted data at a receiver. It is a data processing tool which thereby serves the quick transmission of data, quite irrespective of the transmitted data's substantive content. In that sense, it is akin to various transmission enhancing tools like frequency modulation, amplitude modulation, spread spectrum and other such techniques, which are by fundamental nature content-independent – intended as they are to remain as transparent as possible to the sender and recipient.

One of the notable distinctions addressed earlier is the cited prior art's failing to anywhere disclose, among other things, the actual transmission of a shared image's graphical image data between user stations. The Examiner readily acknowledges that the closest of the cited references in this regard, namely the May et al. reference, prescribes at best transmitting between workstations only the bare information one workstation would need to duplicate upon its own local version of a shared image those changes made by another workstation upon a separate version of the image maintained there. Thus, irrespective of the means by which reliable transmission between stations may be assured, the content of the data (change information) transmitted in May et al. is quite different in nature and function from that (graphical image data) transmitted between transceivers in accordance with each of the pending independent Claims 1, 10, and 14.

To now ignore such content distinctions on the basis of the data compression technique's having been commonly disclosed would be to confuse a transporting vehicle's payload with the transporting vehicle itself. Yet, this is precisely the effect of the Examiner's present rationale

MR2919-16

Serial Number: 09/492,728

for reasserting the earlier rejections of Claims.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the presently stated basis for the Examiner's repeating the earlier rejections is clearly unfounded. Given the previously acknowledged allowability of the pending Claims otherwise, it is believed that the subject Patent Application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee

Registration #40,262


Dated: 11/15/2005

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678  
Customer No. 04586

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit #2675, facsimile number 571-273-8300, on the date shown below.

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

  
Jun Y. Lee

Date: 11/15/2005